



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The Classical Weekly

Entered as second class matter November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1879
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on June 28, 1918

VOL. XIII

NEW YORK, MAY 10, 1920

No. 26

STUDIES IN THE CATILINARIAN ORATIONS

(Concluded from page 196)

(7) What a wealth of information the Third Oration puts at our disposal with respect to letter writing and letter sending among the Romans! To begin with, note Cicero's reference (§ 4) to the report that Lentulus had tampered with the *legati Allobrogum* and that the latter, as they started back to Gaul, were carrying with them *litteras mandataque ad Catilinam*. In § 4, again, Cicero refers to the fact that letters for Catiline had been given to Titus Volturcius. To be sure, special considerations determined the particular acts here set forth, but the practice of delivering letters through mutual friends or mutual acquaintances, a practice rendered inevitable by the lack of an official postal system, can be abundantly established, e. g. through Cicero's Letters. Several pertinent passages are referred to in Lewis and Short, under *tabellarius*.

Next, in § 6, we read:

Litterae quaecumque erant in eo comitatu, integris signis, praetoribus traduntur.

The important words here are, of course, *integris signis*. In § 10 we have:

Primo ostendimus Cethego: signum cognovit. Nos linum incidimus, legimus. Erat scriptum ipsius manu Allobrogum senatui et populo. . . .

Mark the reference here to the *signum*, the cutting of the string, and the very important words *erat scriptum ipsius manu*. As everybody knows, the Romans made liberal use of amanuenses. In writing *ipsius manu Allobrogum senatui et populo*, Cethegus was of course seeking to guarantee the authenticity of his communication; unhappily for him, the possibility which he did not take into his calculations, the possibility of treachery and that his letter would be intercepted, was in fact realized. His letter, written *ipsius manu*, was the most damning evidence of his guilt.

In § 10, again, we read that Statilius recognized *et signum et manum suam*. The next words must be quoted in full:

Tum ostendi tabellas Lentulo et quaesivi cognosceretne signum. Adnuit. "Est vero" inquam "notum quidem signum, imago avi tui, clarissimi viri, qui amavit unice patriam et cives suos". . . .

From this passage we get knowledge of one kind of device, at least, used by the Romans on signet rings.

In § 12 we learn that, at the suggestion of Volturcius, Cicero caused letters to be produced which, so Volturcius declared, had been entrusted to him for delivery to

Catiline. These deeply sarcastic words follow: *Atque ibi vehementissime perturbatus Lentulus tamen et signum et manum suam cognovit*. For other references to seals and handwriting see 3.13; 3.17; 4.4.

(8) In 3.19-21 we get light on Roman business life. Here Cicero refers to the fact that in 65 B. C. many objects on the Capitoline Hill—including a statue of Romulus—had been struck by lightning. Soothsayers, you will remember, were summoned from Etruria. They declared that bloodshed, conflagration, and the destruction of the laws, civil and domestic warfare, were close at hand, unless the gods should be placated. The soothsayers further declared that a larger statue of Jupiter should be built and should be set up on some high spot: further, the statue was to face the East, in a direction opposite to that in which it had faced before. I quote now verbatim (20):

Atque illud signum collocandum consules illi locaverunt, sed tanta fuit operis tarditas ut neque superioribus consulibus neque nobis ante hodiernum diem collocaretur.

It would be an interesting study to examine the use of the business terms *locare* and *collocare*, 'to put out on contract', and the business term of opposite meaning, *conducere*. Such an examination would throw light e. g. on the expression *collocare in matrimonium*. The passage proves, too, that in ancient days as in modern times government could be exasperatingly slow. In § 21 Cicero affects to see the hand of Providence in the fact that, in the early morning hours of the day on which he made this speech to the people in the Forum, two things took place simultaneously—the conspirators, with the witnesses against them, were filing into the Aedes Concordiae, and the larger statue of Jupiter was at last being set in place. Since, manifestly, Cicero could not have staged, himself, by design, all the happenings of this momentous day, we get clear evidence of the early hour at which Roman business and Roman handicrafts began.

(9) The Fourth Oration was delivered in the Senate, the *consilium amplissimum sanctissimumque orbis terrarum*. In § 3 Cicero bids the Senators think of themselves, their wives and their children, and of the Commonwealth, and to forget him entirely; his trust, he declares, is in the gods. Should the worst happen, he will bear it *aequo animo*. His next words are:

Nec tamen ego sum ille ferreus qui fratris carissimi atque amantissimi praesentis maerore non movear horumque omnium lacrimis a quibus me circumsessum videtis.

It would be interesting to gather the references in Latin writers to tears, from the Greco-Roman allusion to tears in that fine narrative of Simo *senex* in Terence, Andria 105-126, which culminates in the famous words, *Hinc illae lacrimae* (used later, at least by Cicero and Juvenal), to Caesar, B. G. 1.39, with its powerful description of the tribuni militum, praefecti, reliquique, qui neque vultum fingere neque interdum lacrimas tenere poterant, and to the passages in which tears are mentioned in the Aeneid. If time allowed, one might make an excursion into kindred fields, to find among the Romans other open expressions of emotion in forms unknown to us Anglo-Saxons, with our pose of (masculine) unemotionalism. Thus, one might collect references to men embracing each other, e. g. Cicero, *Academica Posteriora* 1.1. Once, when Cicero was with Atticus in his villa at Cumae, he heard that the day before Varro had come to Cumae from Rome.

Itaque confestum ad eum ire perreximus, paulumque cum ab eius villa abessemus, ipsum ad nos venientem vidimus, atque eum amplexi, ut mos amicorum est, satis eum longo intervallo ad suam villam reduximus.

With this compare Horace, *Sermones* 1.5.39-44:

Postera lux oritur multo gratissima, namque
Plotius et Varius Sinuessae Vergiliusque
occurrunt, animae qualis neque candidiores
terra tulit neque quis me sit devinctior alter.
O qui complexus et gaudia quanta fuerunt!

During the Great War many an American was, I suppose, amused when, in the picture supplements of the newspapers, or in the 'Movies', he saw a French general kiss some sturdy warrior whom he had just decorated with a cross for distinguished gallantry in action. This French expression of emotion is honorably descended from Roman forebears.

See first such a fine passage as Catullus 9:

Verani, omnibus e meis amicis,
antistans mihi milibus trecentis,
venistine domum ad tuos penates
fratresque unanimos anumque matrem?
Venisti! O mihi nuntii beati!
Visam te incolumem audiamque Hiberum
narrantem loca, facta, nationes,
ut mos est tuus, applicansque collum
iucundum os oculosque saviabor.
O quantum est hominum beatiorum,
quid me laetius est beatiusve?

Compare now three derisive allusions to the custom. First, I cite Martial 12.26:

Sexagena teras cum limina mane senator
esse tibi videor desidiosus eques,
quod non a prima discurram luce per urbem,
et referam lassus basia mille domum.

See also Martial 7.95:

Bruma est et riget horridus December:
audes tu tamen osculo nivali
omnes obvis hinc et hinc tenere
et totam, Line, basiare Romam.
Quid possis graviusque saeviusque
percussus facere atque verberatus?
Hoc me frigore basiet nec uxor
blandis filia nec rudis labellis.

Quare si tibi sensus est pudorque,
hibernas, Line, basiationes
in mensem rogo differas Aprilem.

Even more denunciatory of the abuse of the custom is Martial 11.98:

Effugere non est, Flacce, basiatores:
instant, morantur, persecuntur, occurrunt,
et hinc et illinc, usquequaque, quacumque.
Non ulcus acre pustulaeve lucentes,
nec triste mentum sordidique lichenes,
nec labra pingui delibuta cerato,
nec congelati gutta proderit nasi.
Et aestuantem basiant et algentem
et nuptiale basium reservantem.
Non te cucullis asseret caput tectum
lectica nec te tuta pelle veelope,
nec vindicabit sella saepius clusa:
rimas per omnis basiator intrabit.
Non consulatus ipse, non tribunatus,
senive fasces nec superba clamosi
litoris abiget virga basiatorem:
sedeas in alto tu licet tribunali
et e curuli iura gentibus reddas,
ascendet illa basiator atque illa.
Febricitantem basiaabit et flentem,
dabit oscitanti basium nantantique,
dabit et cacanti. Remedium mali solum est,
facias amicum basiare quem nolis.

One thinks here of a sentence in Suetonius (*Tiberius* 34.2): *Cotidiana oscula edicto prohibuit*. . . . In H. N. 26.1 ff. Pliny writes of a peculiar facial disease which made its appearance in Rome in the middle of the reign of Tiberius. It was called by the Greeks *lichen*, by the Romans, at first only in jest, *mentagra*, because its effects were seen first on the chin (*mentum*). It attacked the whole face, the eyes only being immune. Pliny says the disease was imported from Asia by *quidam Perusinus eques Romanus*. Two sentences must be quoted in full (3-4):

Nec sensere id malum feminae aut servitia plebesque humilis aut media, sed proceres veloci transitu osculi maxime, foediore multorum qui perpeti medicinam toleraverant cicatrice quam morbo. . . . Quo mirabilius quid potest reperiri, aliqua gigni repente vitia terrarum in parte certa membrisque vel aetatibus aut etiam fortunis, tamquam malo eligente, haec in pueris grassari, illa in adultis, haec proceres sentire, illa pauperes.

Lanciani, *Ancient Rome in the Light of Recent Discoveries*, 270-271, refers to the practice of kissing in Roman times. With Martial 11.98 evidently in mind, and interpreting Martial with deadly seriousness, he writes, extravagantly, I think, of the custom. I take special exception to the following words: "The misanthrope Tiberius, who was unwilling to be humbled by this custom, issued an imperial decree against it; but it does not seem to have done much good, as the jokes of the poet above alluded to prove". Now Pliny, l. c., does not say why Tiberius forbade kissing, but, in view of what Pliny says of the disease in question, would the demands either of sound scholarship or of fair play be violated if one were to combine the words of Pliny with those of Suetonius and infer that Tiberius was thinking of the public health rather than of himself when he issued this edict?

(10) In 4.17 there is again matter of interest to the student of Roman business life. Cicero is referring to a report

. . . lenonem quendam Lentuli concursare circum tabernas, pretio sperare sollicitari posse animos egen-tium atque imperitorum.

The report, he admits, is well founded,

. . . sed nulli sunt inventi tam aut fortuna miseri aut voluntate perditii qui non illum ipsum sellae atque operis et quaestus quotidiani locum, qui non cubile ac lectulum suum, qui denique non cursum hunc otiosum vitae suae salvum esse velint. Multo vero maxima pars eorum qui in tabernis sunt, immo vero (id enim potius est dicendum) genus hoc universum amantissimum est oti, etenim omne instrumentum, omnis opera atque quaestus frequentia civium sustentatur, aliter otio, quorum si quaestus ocllusis tabernis minui solet, quid tandem incensis futurum fuit?

Here, certainly, there is an abundance of 'leads' for investigation. One may, for example, look into the history of such technical terms of business as *taberna*, *instrumentum*, *quaestus*; in so doing he will examine many passages throwing light on Roman life. Or he may compare—every teacher of Cicero should compare—certain passages of the *Pro Lege Manilia*. Particularly pertinent are §§ 6, 14–20, in general for their elaborate references to the business of the *publicani*, in particular for the declaration, in § 20, that

Non enim possunt una in civitate multi rem ac fortunas amittere ut non plures secum in eandem trahant calamitatem.

Here is a lesson that, hundreds of years after Cicero uttered these words, great hosts, in our own and other countries, seem not yet to have learned.

Again, Cat. 4.17 might lead one to inquire into the whole subject of the attitude of the Romans toward business, toward little business on the one hand, toward big business, on the other hand, as represented e. g. by the *mercator*, to whom Horace so often refers. Two passages are especially pertinent here. Compare first the later and shorter, Pliny, *Epistles* 1.3.1–2:

Quid agit Comum, tuae meaeque deliciae? quid suburbanum amoenissimum? quid illa porticus? . . . Possident te et per vices partiuntur? an, ut solebas, intentione rei familiaris obeundae crebris excursionibus avocaris? Si possident, felix beatusque es: si minus, unus ex multis. Quin tu (tempus est enim) humiles et sordidas curas aliis mandas et ipse te in alto isto pinguique secessu studiis adseris?

The other passage is the *locus classicus* on the subject, Cicero, *De Officiis* 1.150–151:

Iam de artificiis et quaestibus, qui liberales habendi, qui sordidi sint, haec fere accepimus. Primum improbantur illi quaestus qui in odia hominum incurrunt, ut portitorum, ut faeneratorum. Inliberales autem et sordidi quaestus mercenariorum omnium, quorum operae, non quorum artes emuntur, est enim in illis ipsa merces auctoramentum servitutis. Sordidi etiam putandi, qui mercantur a mercatoribus quod statim vendant, nihil enim proficiant, nisi admodum mentiantur. . . . Opificesque omnes in sordida arte versantur nec enim quicquam ingenium habere potest officina. Minimeque artes eae probandae quae ministratae sunt voluptatum: cetarii, lanii, coqui, fartores,

piscatores, ut ait Terentius; adde huc, si placet, unguentarios, saltatores totumque ludum talarium. Quibus autem artibus aut prudentia maior inest aut non mediocris utilitas quaeritur, ut medicina, ut architectura, ut doctrina rerum honestarum, eae sunt iis quorum ordini conveniunt honestae. Mercatura autem, si tenuis est, sordida putanda est; sin magna et copiosa, multa undique apportans multisque sine vanitate impertiens, non est admodum vituperanda, atque etiam, si satiata quaestu vel contenta potius, ut saepe ex alto in portum, ex ipso quaestu se in agros possessionesque contulit, videtur optimo iure posse laudari. Omnium autem rerum ex quibus aliquid acquiritur nihil est agri cultura melius, nihil uberius, nihil dulcius, nihil homine libero dignius; de qua quoniam in Catone Maiore satis multa diximus, illim assumes quae ad hunc locum pertinent.

The reference in the concluding words is to that wonderful poetical idealization of the delights of agriculture in Cato Maior (= *De Senectute*) 51–57.

Returning now to Cat. 4.17 we find there another interesting word—the word *sella*, used of a workman's bench. Compare Cicero, *Verr.* 4.56. When a certain Lucius Piso was praetor in Spain,

. . . ei . . . anulus aureus quem habebat fractus et comminutus est. Cum vellet sibi anulum facere, aurificem iussit vocari in forum ad sellam <curulem praetoris> Cordubae et palam appendit aurum; hominem in Foro iubet *sellam* ponere et facere omnibus praesentibus.

We know that ancient workmen, shopkeepers, etc., took great liberties with public places, sidewalks, etc., but the rest of Cicero's narrative confirms the impression made by the words cited above, that the setting up of the *sella aurificis* in the Forum was abnormal (as, of course, we should expect).

(11) In Cat. 2.23 singing (playing?) of musical instruments and dancing are condemned; they are grouped with *amare*, *amari*, *sicas*, *vibrare* and *spargere venena*. Divers passages at once leap to the mind. One is Cicero, *Pro Murena* 13:

Saltatorem appellat L. Murenam Cato. Maledicum est, si vere obicitur, vehementis accusatoris, sin falso, maledici conviciatoris. Quare, cum ista sis auctoritate, non debes, Marce, arripere maledictum ex trivio aut ex scurrarum aliquo convicio neque temere consulem populi Romani saltatorem vocare, sed circumspicere quibus praeterea vitiis adfectum esse necesse sit eum cui vere istud obici possit. Nemo enim fere saltat sobrius nisi forte insanit, neque in solitudine neque in convivio moderato atque honesto. Tempestivi convivi, amoeni loci, multarum deliciarum comes est extrema saltatio.

Similar in spirit is the passage in which Horace declares that, in spite of everything, write he must (*Sermones* 2.1.24–30):

Quid faciam? saltat Milonius, ut semel icto accessit fervor capiti numerusque lucernis: Castor gaudet equo, ovo prognatus eodem pugnisi; quot hominum vivunt, totidem studiorum milia; me pedibus delectat claudere verba Lucili ritu nostrum melioris utroque.

Mark next the opening lines of the Praefatio to Nepos's *Lives of Famous Men*:

Non dubito fore plerosque, Attice, qui hoc genus scripturae. . . non satis dignum summorum virorum personis iudicent, cum relatum legent quis musicam docuerit Epaminondam, aut in eius virtutibus commemorari saltasse eum commode scienterque tibiis cantasse. Sed hi erunt fere qui, expertes litterarum Graecarum, nihil rectum nisi quod ipsorum moribus conveniat putabunt.

Compare also Cicero, Tusculan Disputations 1.1-4, especially 3-4, in which Cicero contrasts Greek practice and Roman practice in the matter of acquiring skill in vocal and instrumental music.

Next, compare Sallust, Catilina 25:

Sed in eis erat Sempronia, quae multa saepe virilis audaciae facinora commiserat. Haec mulier . . . fuit litteris Graecis et Latinis docta, psallere, saltare elegantius quam necesse est probae, multa alia quae instrumenta luxuriae sunt. Sed ei cariora semper omnia quam decus atque pudicitia fuit; pecuniae an famae minus parceret haud facile discerneres.

Entirely relevant to the matter more immediately in hand and bearing, too, on the topic discussed next in this paper—the status of actors among the Romans—is a story told by Aulus Gellius 1.5.2-3:

. . . Q. Hortensius omnibus fere oratoribus aetatis suae, nisi M. Tullio, clarior, quod multa munditia et circumspicte compositeque indutus et amictus esset manusque eius inter agendum forent argutae admodum et gestuosae, maledictis compellationibusque probris iactatus est, multaque in eum, quasi in histrionem, in ipsis causis atque iudiciis dicta sunt. Sed cum L. Torquatus, subagresti homo ingenio et infestivo, gravius acerbissime apud consilium iudicum, cum de causa Sullae quaereretur, non iam histrionem eum esse diceret, sed gesticulariam Dionysiamque eum notissimae saltatriculae nomine appellaret, tum voce molli atque demissa "Dionysia" inquit "Dionysia malo equidem esse quam quod tu, Torquate, *ἀμουσος, ἀναφρόδιτος, ἀπορροδίωνσος*".

(12) I note next the phrase *nemo in scaena levior et nequior*, in 2.9. The suggestions of this passage are crystallized for us in the famous story of D. Laberius, the *eques* who was obliged by Caesar to act in his own mimes. The story is told at length by Macrobius, Saturnalia 2.7, but more tersely and powerfully by Suetonius, Iulius 39:

Ludis Decimus Laberius eques Romanus mimum suum egit donatusque quingentis sestertiis et anulo aureo sessum in quattuordecim a scaena per orchestram transiit.

The moment he became an actor Laberius forfeited all rights as a citizen, including, of course, his status as an *eques*; the gift of the ring and the 500,000 *sestertii* was a token of his restoration, by executive fiat, to equestrian rank. Gellius 20.4 cites Aristotle for proof that actors are as a class worthless: 'they are sometimes "flush" with money, sometimes out of funds; both states are conducive to worthlessness'.

(13) Lastly, we may, if we will, follow the suggestions conveyed by the variant reading *lecticis* in 2.20 (A. C. Clark, Oxford Classical Text Series, has *praediis lectis*). One might examine the use of *lecticae* and *sellae* (*gestatoriae*) both in and out of Rome: when did the use begin? what was thought of the use of *lecticae* by men,

etc.. etc. One might then go on to study the use of 'chairs' in modern times, ending with such surviving specimens as the one in Pickwick Papers, or that in Mrs. Gaskell's Cranford, or the one of which Kipling speaks in The Incarnation of Krishna Mulvaney.

C. K.

REVIEWS

Second Latin Book for Junior High Schools. By Frederick Warren Sanford and Harry Fletcher Scott. Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Company (1919). Pp. xviii + 408 + 81. \$1.20.

The book under review is a companion volume to the First Latin Book for Junior High Schools reviewed in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 13.70-71, but is considerably more voluminous (507 pages compared to 357). It is similar in binding, type, and paper, all excellent. It contains twenty-one cuts, but three of which would attract the attention of most young people. The contents of the book are as follows.

Part I (pages 1-56). This gives the stories of Perseus and Hercules from Fabulae Faciles, with the subjunctive eliminated from the latter story, and with notes and partial vocabularies printed at the foot of the page in both of the stories.

Part II (pages 57-125). This gives a series of thirty-five Lessons containing the inflections and the principles of syntax which were postponed from the First Book. These lessons do not differ from those of any First Latin Book except that there are innovations in the order of presentation (e. g. the first use of the subjunctive is in clauses of result, and the second in *cum*-causal clauses); and in the use of some unusual nomenclature. Thus, "Noun Clauses of Fact" means the subjunctive clause subject of *fit* and *accidit*; "Cum Descriptive Clauses of Situation" means the circumstantial use of this conjunction; a distinction is made between "future passive participle" (*Auxilium mittendum est*) and "gerundive" (*Spes urbis capiendae*); "Noun Clauses of Desire" means substantive clauses of purpose; "Relative Clauses of Description" means clauses of characteristic; "The Volitive Subjunctive in Principal Clauses" means the jussive and hortatory subjunctives. A third variation from most First Latin Books is found in the presentation of a number of topics which are usually considered too difficult or too unimportant for beginners. Such are the supine, the subjunctive of characteristic, the optative subjunctive, the anticipatory subjunctive, the future imperative with forms printed in the lesson, the genitive with verbs, the subjunctive of attraction.

Part III (pages 126-241). This part includes The Argonauts, from Fabulae Faciles, with notes and partial vocabularies at the foot of the page, and Stories from Roman History, partly written in excellent form by the authors, partly adapted from Viri Romae.

Part IV (pages 242-294). Here is given Caesar's Gallic War, Book 1, somewhat simplified, especially by printing in direct form practically all the indirect discourse.